

## REMARKS

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. and 35 U.S.C. § 103

Within the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4-8, 11-21, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Publication No.: 2002/0133555 to Hall et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Hall”) in view of United States Patent Publication No.: 2002/0162028 to Kennedy (hereinafter referred to as “Kennedy”).

The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because the claims, as amended, contain additional limitations not found in either Hall or Kennedy. Specifically, neither Hall nor Kennedy disclose a system for controlling access to a printing environment comprising: “a means for sending a request to the directory server from the at least one client device comprising an availability inquiry about the availability of an at least one printing device; a means for processing the request and issuing a reply message to the at least one client device, wherein the reply message comprises all the configuration information necessary for the client device to configure the at least one printer to print files from the at least one client device; and a means for configuring the at least one printer to print at least one file from the at least one client device.”

On the contrary, Hall discloses a directory server which includes a company directory that provides employee information, wherein the directory server is accessed and wherein received destination information is compared with information within the company directory. Hall does not even mention printing device configuration. Furthermore, Hall does not provide a means for “sending configuration data to a printing device from the directory server nor does it provide a means for configuring the at least one printer to print at least one file from the at least one client device.”

Equally inconsistent with the Applicant’s teachings, Kennedy discloses a centralized directory structure that disseminates replicate authentication information to customer data centers such that the transmission of information is not required. On the contrary, the Applicant’s claimed invention does require the transmission of access data by means of the “availability inquiry”.

Furthermore, Kennedy does not even mention printing device configuration. Furthermore, Kennedy does not provide a means for sending configuration data to a printing device from the directory server nor does it provide a means for configuring the at least one printer to print at least one file from the at least one client device.”

On the contrary, claim 1, as currently amended, contains these limitations explicitly. Likewise claims 3, 5-8 and 11-13 contain the limitation by reference to claim 1. For at least these reasons claims 1, 3, 5-8 and 11-13 are allowable over the teachings of Hall and Kennedy.

### **Conclusion**

As set forth above, all of the rejections as been overcome. Therefore claims 1, 3, 5-8 and 11-13 are in condition for allowance and an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance would be appreciated.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the application, he is respectfully urged to contact Applicant’s attorney at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Glenn

Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862